



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/532,235	03/22/2000	Masahiro Ishigami	13478	8479
23389	7590	04/26/2004	EXAMINER	
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA GARDEN CITY, NY 11530			LELE, TANMAY S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2684	15

DATE MAILED: 04/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/532,235	ISHIGAMI, MASAHIRO
	Examiner Tanmay S Lele	Art Unit 2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 9-15,17,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 9-15,17,19 and 20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 March 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05 February 2004 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 12, 9, 13, 14, 15, and 19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 5 of U.S.

Patent No. 6,415,165 in view of Moriya (Moriya, UK Patent Application GB 2, 328,343).

Regarding claim 9, the present invention is of a mobile terminal with an operation entry part and a display area on a front thereof (claims 1 – 5 of US Patent 6,415,165), comprising: a touch panel provided on a back of the terminal to allow a user, while holding the terminal with a hand, to perform an entry operation with a finger of the hand holding the terminal (claims 1 – 5 of US Patent 6,415,165); and a display screen displaying said recognized information, said display screen being disposed in said display area (claims 1 – 5 of US Patent 6,415,165) and a processor performing processing according to a position at which, or a manner in which, said user presses said touch panel (claims 1 – 5 of US Patent 6,415,165) and wherein pressing said touch panel once accepts said recognized information and pressing said touch panel touch selects the entry operation (claims 1 – 5 of US Patent 6,415,165).

Claims 1 – 5 of US Patent 6,415,165 do not specifically teach of a recognition device recognizing a hand-entered information entered from said touch panel.

In a related art dealing with a portable apparatus having an additional display on a second surface, Moriya teaches of a recognition device recognizing a hand-entered information entered from said touch panel (as seen in Figures 3 and 7 and detailed on page 7, lines 24 – 27, the abstract, and starting page 18, line 14 and ending page 19, line, 17; note that it is inherent to Moriya to have such a device as it is displaying hand-written characters as seen in Figure 7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Claims 1 – 5 of US Patent 6,415,165, Moriya's hand-written entry means, for the purposes of effectively utilizing un-used areas on a handset to input or

display data without compromising the portability and operability of the portable radio apparatus, as taught by Moriya.

Regarding claim 9, US Patent 6,415,165 in view of Moriya, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Moriya further teaches that wherein said information comprises hand-written character as seen in Figures 3 and 7 and detailed on page 7, lines 24 – 27, the abstract, and starting page 18, line 14 and ending page 19, line 17).

Regarding claim 13, US Patent 6,415,165 in view of Moriya, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. US Patent 6,415,165 further teaches of further comprising a selecting device executing either at least one of selection, acceptance, and cancellation of an item displayed in said display area or a scroll of the display screen, according to a position at which, or a manner in which, said user presses said touch panel (claims 1 – 5 of US Patent 6,415,165).

Regarding claim 14, US Patent 6,415,165 in view of Moriya, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. US Patent 6,415,165 further teaches comprising at least one switch on a front of said mobile terminal for controlling acceptance and cancellation of an entry operation through said touch panel, said switch each being provided at a position, when said user holds said mobile terminal with a hand, where the user can press the switch with a finger of the hand holding said mobile terminal (claims 1 – 5 of US Patent 6,415,165).

Regarding claim 15, US Patent 6,415,165 in view of Moriya, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 14. US Patent 6,415,165 further teaches wherein said at least one switch is disposed at a position that can be accessed by a finger other than an

index finger of the hand, said position being on a front side or a side wall of the mobile terminal (claims 1 – 5 of US Patent 6,415,165).

Regarding claim 19, US Patent 6,415,165 in view of Moriya, teach all the claim limitations as recited in claim 12. Moriya further teaches of comprising a recognition device recognizing graphic information from a locus of the graphic, when graphic information is entered through said touch panel (as seen in Figures 3 and 7 and detailed on page 7, lines 24 – 27, the abstract, and starting page 18, line 14 and ending page 19, line, 17; note that it is inherent to Moriya to have such a device as it is displaying hand-written characters as seen in Figure 7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 9 –11, 13 –15, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 12, it was not understood if the touch panel was able to perform the processes of "...wherein pressing said touch panel once accepts said recognized information and pressing said touch panel twice selects the entry operation." Applicant states page 17, lines 2 to page 18 line 5, page 18, line 18, to page 19, line and Figures 3, 8, and 9 as support (as per paper number 14, pages 7 and 8), but upon review of the cited sections, the desired functionality was noted as being performed by a key (as per the specification, page 17, lines 20 –22 and page 18, lines 10 –13 and starting page 18, line 23 and ending page 19, line 1; the keying process defined starting page 15, line 15

and ending page 16, line 8). For purposes of examination, it was assumed that a keying means performed the functions described by the above passages. It was also assumed that alternately, the touch pad was capable of performing the described functions (as could possible be assumed from page 5, lines 21 –24 of the specification, though not further explained elsewhere in the specification with relation the claimed). Appropriate clarification and further support are required.

Claims 9 –11, 13 –15, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected for at least the reasons as seen in independent claim 12.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 12, 9, 13, 14, 15, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior et al. (Prior, US Patent No. 6,349,220) in view of Moriya (Moriya, UK Patent Application GB 2, 328,343) and in further view of Shigeru (Shigeru, Japanese Patent Application No. 09-120960).

Regarding claim 12, Prior teaches of a mobile terminal with an operation entry part and a display area on a front thereof (Figures 6a and 6b), comprising: a touch panel provided on a back of the terminal to allow a user, while holding the terminal with a hand, to perform an entry operation with a finger of the hand holding the terminal (Figures 6a and 6b and starting column 3, line 47 and ending column 5, line 5); and a display screen displaying said recognized information, said display screen being disposed

in said display area (column 1, lines 25 – 37 and seen in Figures 6a, 6b, 7a, and 7b) and a processor performing processing according to a position at which, or a manner in which, said user presses said touch panel (as seen in Figures 6a and 6b and starting column 4, line 47 and ending column 5, line 12).

Prior does not specifically teach of a recognition device recognizing a hand-entered information entered from said touch panel or wherein pressing said touch panel once accepts said recognized information and pressing said touch panel touch selects the entry operation.

In a related art dealing with a portable apparatus having an additional display on a second surface, Moriya teaches of a recognition device recognizing a hand-entered information entered from said touch panel (as seen in Figures 3 and 7 and detailed on page 7, lines 24 – 27, the abstract, and starting page 18, line 14 and ending page 19, line, 17; note that it is inherent to Moriya to have such a device as it is displaying hand-written characters as seen in Figure 7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Prior's touch panel, Moriya's hand-written entry means, for the purposes of effectively utilizing un-used areas on a handset to input or display data without compromising the portability and operability of the portable radio apparatus, as taught by Moriya.

Prior in view of Moriya do not specifically teach of wherein pressing said touch panel once accepts said recognized information and pressing said touch panel touch selects the entry.

In a related art dealing with mobile audio terminal, Shigeru teaches of wherein pressing said touch panel once accepts said recognized information and pressing said touch panel touch selects the entry (paragraph 0029; solution).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Prior and Moriya's mobile touch pad device, Shigeru's processing commands, for the purposes of easily selecting and executing functions and programs using one key, as taught by Shigeru.

Regarding claim 9, Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Moriya further teaches that wherein said information comprises hand-written character (as seen in Figures 3 and 7 and detailed on page 7, lines 24 – 27, the abstract, and starting page 18, line 14 and ending page 19, line 17).

Regarding claim 13, Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Prior further teaches of further comprising a selecting device executing either at least one of selection, acceptance, and cancellation of an item displayed in said display area or a scroll of the display screen, according to a position at which, or a manner in which, said user presses said touch panel (column 1, lines 25 –47, Figures 6a and 6b, and starting column 4, line 47 and ending column 5, line 12).

Regarding claim 14, Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Prior further teaches comprising at least one switch on a front of said mobile terminal for controlling acceptance and cancellation of an entry operation through said touch panel, said switch each being provided at a position, when said user holds said mobile terminal with a hand, where the user can press the switch with

a finger of the hand holding said mobile terminal (as seen in Figures 1, 6a, and 6b and column 3, lines 31 – 60).

Regarding claim 15, Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 14. Prior further teaches wherein said at least one switch is disposed at a position that can be accessed by a finger other than an index finger of the hand, said position being on a front side or a side wall of the mobile terminal (as seen in Figures 1, 6a, and 6b and column 3, lines 31 – 60).

Regarding claim 19, Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru, teach all the claim limitations as recited in claim 12. Moriya further teaches of comprising a recognition device recognizing graphic information from a locus of the graphic, when graphic information is entered through said touch panel (as seen in Figures 3 and 7 and detailed on page 7, lines 24 – 27, the abstract, and starting page 18, line 14 and ending page 19, line, 17; note that it is inherent to Moriya to have such a device as it is displaying hand-written characters as seen in Figure 7).

9. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior et al. (Prior, US Patent No. 6,349,220) in view of Moriya (Moriya, UK Patent Application GB 2, 328,343) and Shigeru (Shigeru, Japanese Patent Application No. 09-120960) as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Armstrong et al. (Armstrong, US Patent No. 5,729,219).

Regarding claim 10, Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru, do not specifically teach of further comprising: a detection device detecting a touch operation when said user touches and strokes said touch panel and for moving information or a

pointer according to a movement of said finger on said touch panel, said information and said pointer being displayed by said display.

In a related art dealing with a selective call radio with contra-posed touch pad, Armstrong teaches of further comprising: a detection device detecting a touch operation when said user touches and strokes said touch panel and for moving information or a pointer according to a movement of said finger on said touch panel, said information and said pointer being displayed by said display (as seen in Figures 1 – 6 and column 3, lines 22 – 52).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Prior, Moriya, and Shigeru's device, Armstrong's pointer motion, for the purposes of effectively controlling the movement of a pointer appearing on the display identical to the scale of movement on the display, as taught by Armstrong.

Regarding claim 11, Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru, do not specifically teach of further comprising: pointer device configured to move the pointer to a predetermined position according to the movement of said finger on said touch panel when said user strokes said touch panel with the finger and, when the user presses said touch panel in this state, to scroll the display screen in said display area vertically or horizontally.

In a related art dealing with a selective call radio with contra-posed touch pad, Armstrong teaches of further comprising: pointer device configured to move the pointer to a predetermined position according to the movement of said finger on said touch panel when said user strokes said touch panel with the finger and, when the user presses said

touch panel in this state, to scroll the display screen in said display area vertically or horizontally (as seen in Figures 1 – 6 and column 3, lines 22 – 52).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Prior and Moriya and Shigeru's device, Armstrong's pointer motion, for the purposes of effectively controlling the movement of a pointer appearing on the display identical to the scale of movement on the display, as taught by Armstrong.

10. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior et al. (Prior, US Patent No. 6,349,220) in view of Moriya (Moriya, UK Patent Application GB 2,328,343) and Shigeru (Shigeru, Japanese Patent Application No. 09-120960) as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Kisaichi et al. (Kisaichi, US Patent No. 5,786,776).

Regarding claim 17, Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Both Prior and Moriya teach of wherein a type of the hand-entered information or hand-written character entered through said touch panel includes alphanumeric characters (as seen in Figure 7 of Moriya and detailed in column 1, lines 37 – 47 of Prior).

Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru, do not teach [a type of the hand-entered information or hand-written character entered through said touch panel includes] at least one of Japanese kana syllabary, kanji.

In a related art dealing with character input into a cellular telephone, Kisaichi teaches of [a type of the hand-entered information or hand-written character entered through said touch panel includes] at least one of (a) Japanese kana syllabary, (b)

Japanese kanji, and (c) alphanumeric characters (Figure 25, and starting column 28, line 61 and ending column 29, line 67).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Prior, Moriya, and Shigeru's mobile touch pad, Kisaichi's Kana entry, for the purposes of using the phone in the Far East (and hence be able to display or enter names or address in Japan), as taught Kisaichi.

11. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior et al. (Prior, US Patent No. 6,349,220) in view of Moriya (Moriya, UK Patent Application GB 2,328,343) and Shigeru (Shigeru, Japanese Patent Application No. 09-120960) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Capps et al. (Capps, US Patent No. 5,583,833).

Regarding claim 20, Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 19. Prior in view of Moriya and Shigeru do not teach of further comprising an arrangement of a minute hand and a hour hand of a clock from the graphic information to provide time information from said entered locus.

In an analogous art dealing with setting an analog clock on a computer system, Capps teaches of further comprising an arrangement of a minute hand and a hour hand of a clock from the graphic information to provide time information from said entered locus (as seen in Figures 3 and detailed in column 2, lines 21 – 50).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Prior, Moriya, and Shigeru's mobile touch pad graphical display, Capps' pen/stylus/touch pad based analog clock setting mechanism, for the purpose of easily setting time with a pointer, as taught by Capps.

12. Claims 12, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior et al. (Prior, US Patent No. 6,349,220) in view of Moriya (Moriya, UK Patent Application GB 2, 328,343) and in further view of Yates et al. (Yates, US Patent No. 6,255,976).

Regarding claim 12, Prior teaches of a mobile terminal with an operation entry part and a display area on a front thereof (Figures 6a and 6b), comprising: a touch panel provided on a back of the terminal to allow a user, while holding the terminal with a hand, to perform an entry operation with a finger of the hand holding the terminal (Figures 6a and 6b and starting column 3, line 47 and ending column 5, line 5); and a display screen displaying said recognized information, said display screen being disposed in said display area (column 1, lines 25 – 37 and seen in Figures 6a, 6b, 7a, and 7b) and a processor performing processing according to a position at which, or a manner in which, said user presses said touch panel (as seen in Figures 6a and 6b and starting column 4, line 47 and ending column 5, line 12).

Prior does not specifically teach of a recognition device recognizing a hand-entered information entered from said touch panel or wherein pressing said touch panel once accepts said recognized information and pressing said touch panel touch selects the entry operation.

In a related art dealing with a portable apparatus having an additional display on a second surface, Moriya teaches of a recognition device recognizing a hand-entered information entered from said touch panel (as seen in Figures 3 and 7 and detailed on page 7, lines 24 – 27, the abstract, and starting page 18, line 14 and ending page 19, line,

17; note that it is inherent to Moriya to have such a device as it is displaying hand-written characters as seen in Figure 7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Prior's touch panel, Moriya's hand-written entry means, for the purposes of effectively utilizing un-used areas on a handset to input or display data without compromising the portability and operability of the portable radio apparatus, as taught by Moriya.

Prior in view of Moriya do not specifically teach of wherein pressing said touch panel once accepts said recognized information and pressing said touch panel touch selects the entry.

In an analogous art dealing with a remote computer input peripheral, Yates teaches of wherein pressing said touch panel once accepts said recognized information and pressing said touch panel touch selects the entry (Figure 1 and column 4, lines 22 – 29).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Prior and Moriya's mobile touch pad device, Yates's processing commands, for the purposes of easily selecting and executing functions thereby enabling a user to effectively use both hands, as taught by Yates.

Regarding claim 9, Prior in view of Moriya and Yates, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Moriya further teaches that wherein said information comprises hand-written character (as seen in Figures 3 and 7 and detailed on page 7, lines 24 – 27, the abstract, and starting page 18, line 14 and ending page 19, line 17).

Regarding claim 10, Prior in view of Moriya and Yates, teach all the claimed

limitations as recited in claim 12. Yates teaches of further comprising: a detection device detecting a touch operation when said user touches and strokes said touch panel and for moving information or a pointer according to a movement of said finger on said touch panel, said information and said pointer being displayed by said display (Figure 1 and column 2, lines 1 –5 and column 4, lines 22 –29).

Regarding claim 11, Prior in view of Moriya and Yates, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Yates further teaches of comprising: pointer device configured to move the pointer to a predetermined position according to the movement of said finger on said touch panel when said user strokes said touch panel with the finger (column 4, lines 22 –29) and, when the user presses said touch panel in this state, to scroll the display screen in said display area vertically or horizontally (and column 4, lines 22 –29 and column 4, lines 35 –39).

Regarding claim 13, Prior in view of Moriya and Yates, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Prior further teaches of further comprising a selecting device executing either at 1 east one of selection, acceptance, and cancellation of an item displayed in said display area or a scroll of the display screen, according to a position at which, or a manner in which, said user presses said touch panel (column 1, lines 25 –47, Figures 6a and 6b, and starting column 4, line 47 and ending column 5, line 12).

Regarding claim 14, Prior in view of Moriya and Yates, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Prior further teaches comprising at least one switch on a front of said mobile terminal for controlling acceptance and cancellation of an entry operation through said touch panel, said switch each being provided at a position, when said user holds said mobile terminal with a hand, where the user can press the switch with

a finger of the hand holding said mobile terminal (as seen in Figures 1, 6a, and 6b and column 3, lines 31 – 60).

Regarding claim 15, Prior in view of Moriya and Yates, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 14. Prior further teaches wherein said at least one switch is disposed at a position that can be accessed by a finger other than an index finger of the hand, said position being on a front side or a side wall of the mobile terminal (as seen in Figures 1, 6a, and 6b and column 3, lines 31 – 60).

Regarding claim 19, Prior in view of Moriya and Yates, teach all the claim limitations as recited in claim 12. Moriya further teaches of comprising a recognition device recognizing graphic information from a locus of the graphic, when graphic information is entered through said touch panel (as seen in Figures 3 and 7 and detailed on page 7, lines 24 – 27, the abstract, and starting page 18, line 14 and ending page 19, line, 17; note that it is inherent to Moriya to have such a device as it is displaying hand-written characters as seen in Figure 7).

13. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior et al. (Prior, US Patent No. 6,349,220) in view of Moriya (Moriya, UK Patent Application GB 2,328,343) and Yates et al. (Yates, US Patent No. 6,255,976) as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Kisaichi et al. (Kisaichi, US Patent No. 5,786,776).

Regarding claim 17, Prior in view of Moriya and Yates, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Both Prior and Moriya teach of wherein a type of the hand-entered information or hand-written character entered through said touch panel includes alphanumeric characters (as seen in Figure 7 of Moriya and detailed in column 1, lines 37 – 47 of Prior).

Prior in view of Moriya and Yates, do not teach [a type of the hand-entered information or hand-written character entered through said touch panel includes] at least one of Japanese kana syllabary, kanji.

In a related art dealing with character input into a cellular telephone, Kisaichi teaches of [a type of the hand-entered information or hand-written character entered through said touch panel includes] at least one of (a) Japanese kana syllabary, (b) Japanese kanji, and (c) alphanumeric characters (Figure 25, and starting column 28, line 61 and ending column 29, line 67).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Prior, Moriya, and Yates's mobile touch pad, Kisaichi's Kana entry, for the purposes of using the phone in the Far East (and hence be able to display or enter names or address in Japan), as taught Kisaichi.

14. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior et al. (Prior, US Patent No. 6,349,220) in view of Moriya (Moriya, UK Patent Application GB 2,328,343) and Yates et al. (Yates, US Patent No. 6,255,976) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Capps et al. (Capps, US Patent No. 5,583,833).

Regarding claim 20, Prior in view of Moriya and Yates, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 19. Prior in view of Moriya and Yates do not teach of further comprising an arrangement of a minute hand and a hour hand of a clock from the graphic information to provide time information from said entered locus.

In an analogous art dealing with setting an analog clock on a computer system, Capps teaches of further comprising an arrangement of a minute hand and a hour hand of

a clock from the graphic information to provide time information from said entered locus (as seen in Figures 3 and detailed in column 2, lines 21 – 50).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Prior, Moriya, and Yates's mobile touch pad graphical display, Capps' pen/stylus/touch pad based analog clock setting mechanism, for the purpose of easily setting time with a pointer, as taught by Capps.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Inventor	Publication	Number	Disclosure
Martinelli et al.	US Patent	5,943,044	Force Sensing Semiconductive Touchpad

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanmay S Lele whose telephone number is (703) 305-3462. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 - 6:30 PM Monday – Thursdays and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A. Maung can be reached on (703) 308-7745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2684

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.


Tanmay S Lele
Examiner
Art Unit 2684

tsl
April 15, 2004


NAY MAUNG

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER